

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/772,984	02/05/2004	Otto Carl Ziemann	A01489	5214	
21898 75	90 04/10/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY			RONESI, VICKEY M		
PATENT DEPARTMENT 100 INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST			. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELPH	IA, PA 19106-2399	•	1714	1714	
			DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006	DATE MAIL ED: 04/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/772,984	ZIEMANN ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Vickey Ronesi	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the safter the mailing date of the final rejection	The appropriate extension fee under 37 final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) on, even if timely filed, may reduce any				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: see attached. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.						
5. $igsqcup$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
 7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) solution will not be entered, or b) solution will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-10</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						

Art Unit: 1714

Attachment to Advisory Action

Applicants' amendment filed 3/31/2006 has been considered; however, the amendment

has <u>not</u> been entered given that it raises other new issues that would require further consideration

and/or search.

With respect to other new issues, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to further limit the

polymer, wherein the polymer is made of a mixture of polymer particles and those particles are

further described in new claims 11-21. It is the examiner's position that this is a new issue since

a mixture of polymer particles was not heretofore examined and would therefore require further

consider and/or search. Furthermore, new claims 12 and 18 would be subject to a 35 USC

112(2) rejection since it is not made clear if the first polymer phase can contain crosslinking

groups other than acetoacetoxy and cyanoacetoxy groups. If all crosslinking groups are

excluded, claims and 12 and 18 would be broader in scope than the independent claims since the

independent claims require the polymer (which includes both phases) to have a crosslinking

group.

In the interest of better enabling the applicants to assess the patentability of their claims,

the following advisory.

Applicant argues that Bors et al does not disclose first and second polymer phases with

specific weight percentages.

In response, applicant's attention is drawn to examples 21, 22, and 23 where mixtures

and core-shell polymers are disclosed. Example 22 discloses a 50/50 (w/w) mixture.

4/5/2006

Vickey Ronesi

m Tagarnethen TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700